

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending. By this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended and Claim 6 is canceled. Because support for the claim amendments is provided in the originally filed application, see for example, paragraphs [0029] and [0031] and Figs. 3, 4A and 4B, Applicants respectfully submit no new matter is presented herein.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,127,764 to Torok in view of JP 55-086361 to Chiaki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,557,239 to Takahashi et al. (Takahashi). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torok in view of Chorok and Takahashi, as applied to Claim 4 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,972,499 to Emoto.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reason(s).

Claim 1 recites a rotor for a permanent magnet type motor, including a rotor yoke having a stacked structure; a permanent magnet connected on an outer radial peripheral surface of the rotor yoke; and a metal film which ***encompasses an entire outer surface of the permanent magnet and is also disposed between the rotor yoke and the permanent magnet.***

As illustrated in the exemplary embodiment shown in Fig. 3, the metal film is provided on an entire outer surface of the permanent magnet, including the “inner” surface of the permanent magnet that faces the outer periphery of the rotor yoke. Corrosion of the permanent magnet and damage to the surface of the magnet can be effectively prevented by the metal film.

The Office Action admits that Torok fails to show a metal film disposed between the rotor yoke and the permanent magnet. Applicants further submit that Torok fails to teach or suggest a metal film encompassing an entire outer surface of the magnet as well.

The Office Action looks to Chiaki to cure the admitted deficiency of Torok. Applicants note that while Chiaki appears to teach a metal film 5, 7 that is provided (evaporated) on the surface of the magnet 4 which is connected to the rotor seat 6, Chiaki, like Torok, fails to teach or suggest the metal film 5, 7 encompassing an **entire outer surface** of the permanent magnet 4.

Takahashi discloses welding of a stator, but does not disclose connecting a rotor and a permanent magnet or even a metal film which encompasses an entire outer surface of the permanent magnet. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Takahashi does not overcome or otherwise address the above described deficiencies of Torok and Chiaki.

Emoto is cited for teaching a motor structure wherein the metal film has a particular nickel composition. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Emoto, like Takahashi, does not overcome the above described deficiencies of Torok and Chiaki.

Because Torok, Chiaki, Takahashi, and Emoto, alone or in any combination thereof, do not teach or suggest all of the features of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that even if any one of the references were modified according to the teachings of the other references, the modified reference would not resemble or arrive at the claimed invention. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references and therefore, Claim 1 should be allowable.

Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims should also be deemed allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants request withdrawal of both of the rejections.


Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections, allowance of Claim 1-5, and the prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 108421-00122.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000
MO/elp